

THE CATHOLIC MIND

Vol. XXXVI

APRIL 8, 1938

No. 847

Christ and Social Justice

FRANCIS X. TALBOT, S.J.

*Address delivered over the Church of the Air, Columbia network,
February 20, 1938.*

THE demand of the men and women of today is for justice. This demand for justice is not something new, something heretofore unheard of; rather, it has been the demand of every man since the beginning of human time. This demand for justice is inherent in the Old Law of the Jews that antedated Christ, and it is essential in the Law of the Christians that followed the teachings of Jesus Christ. The demand for justice is one of the causes for organized society, for the establishment of government, and for the erection of civil courts and tribunals. If man is to live with man in peace and security and prosperity, there must be justice between man and man, and not only justice between man and man, there must be justice between the individual man and the body of men with whom he lives. There must furthermore be justice between the individual man and the government to which he pays his loyalty, as there must be justice between the government and the individual man who pledges to support it.

Today the demand for justice is more insistent, more vehement, more imperative, more intelligent than

it has ever been before. This characteristic of our times is due to many factors,—but I cannot now take time to enumerate them, nor to prove them. We as a people have become so conscious of the injustices of our present form of society and government, that we are impelled to immediate and decisive action. We as a people have so tolerated and suffered under injustices of various types and degrees, that we are determined no longer to permit them to be perpetuated. In this firm and insistent demand for justice in all departments of the social order, the Protestant and the Jewish citizen of the United States, the citizen who professes no religion but accounts himself an agnostic and an atheist, are in full agreement with the Catholic Church which has for nineteen hundred years preached the demand that there must be universal and comprehensive justice for all. In preaching thus, the Catholic Church only repeated what Christ Himself taught and demanded.

JUSTICE MUST BE TEMPERED WITH CHARITY

In the teaching of Jesus, there are two laws: that of justice and that of charity and love. Justice is fundamental and basic: give every man his due. But justice when applied rigidly according to law and right, may result in injustice. Therefore must justice, in the Christian concept, be tempered by charity and love. Later, I shall speak of the charity needed to make naked justice, just. For the moment, I remember that touchstone answer Jesus gave to those who attempted to entangle Him in an apparent conflict of rights: "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's." This, I say, is a touchstone verdict for all justice: "Render to John the things that are John's, and to James the things that are James." "Render to corporations the things that are of the corporation, and to the labor union the things that are of the labor

union." "Render to Government the things that belong to Government, and to the citizen the things that belong to the citizen."

This precept of Christ is fundamental to the Catholic concept of justice. It includes the notion that there must be preserved the balance of rights and of duties. Justice strives for an equilibrium between the *rights* of John and the *duties* of James, as well as between the *duties* of John and the *rights* of James. The employer has *rights* and *duties*, as also has the employe. The Government has *rights* and *duties*, as has every citizen, even the smallest and the most unimportant. In justice, these *rights* must be preserved to the fullest extent. But in justice, these *duties* must also be fulfilled to an equally full extent. Otherwise, there will be injustice that cries to Heaven and God for final settlement.

INJUSTICE A SIN

In the Catholic concept, justice is a virtue, and injustice is a sin. When I say that justice is a virtue, I mean that it is a constant and impelling force in the will that always and under all circumstances must operate and must operate effectively. Justice must be a habit of the mind and will, not a sporadic instance of a good act performed now and again. And when I say that injustice is a sin, I am using a term that, to a Catholic, is the worst possible term that may be applied to any human act. It means more than the term, let us say, revolting, or nauseating, or disgusting, or horrible, or outrageous; it means all of these and more. Sin is the strongest word of condemnation in the vocabulary of a Catholic. Injustice of any sort is a sin.

It is not the virtue of justice, in general, that concerns us today. It is that special and distinctive form of justice which, in our modern terminology, is called Social Justice, that form of justice which preserves

the balance between the duties and rights of the citizen, or individual, and the social community or society. This balance must be preserved regardless of what type of government acts as the agent of the social community: whether the government be monarchical, democratic, republican, corporative, Fascist, Nazist, Socialist, Communist. In Social Justice, the citizen has upon him the *duty* to render to the State in its proper sphere as the agent of society what the State has a *right* to possess, for the common good of all people and all classes within the State. Thus, Social Justice may be said to be the contrary to Distributive Justice, in which the citizen, or the subject or the individual has a *right* to demand of the State what is his due, and the State has the duty to render to the individual protection, security, equality and all that he has a right to possess and enjoy.

STATE HAS DUTY

Without drawing these ethical and moral distinctions too finely, or delaying further upon them, briefly, we may assert that the Government has the *right* to legislate in regard to social injustice, and furthermore, to affirm that the State has a *duty* to strive through legislative, executive and judicial processes for the establishment of social justice for all individuals and classes. On the other hand, the citizen and classes of citizens have a *right* to demand of the State the preservation and protection of their liberties and possessions; they have also the *duty* to accept that Governmental legislation and ruling which is judged to be for the common good of all citizens and classes.

There is a demand in the United States for justice. It is an insistent demand that cannot be shunted off by nice words nor smothered by *laissez faire*. There is not one demand, there are many demands; not a unified demand but conflicting demands; unless these conflicting demands are adjusted, there can be no

social peace in our nation, no security, no prosperity, no future. The Government in Washington and in the States must so balance duties and rights between citizens and classes that there will be the equilibrium of justice for all. But our legislators and executives are faced with problems that appear almost insoluble to human and material-minded men. Unless our legislators and executives and judges are guided by God and the eternal principles enunciated by Christ, they will fail miserably in their efforts to legislate and to maintain justice.

This is neither the time nor the occasion to express my personal views upon the social legislation that the Government and Congress is proposing in the matter of Social Justice. I say only that I pray, and all Catholics pray with me, that God may give wisdom to those whom we have elected to legislate justice for us all, so that when the tax bills are presented, when the appropriations for relief are being made, when social insurance is being guaranteed, when industry and agriculture are being regulated or controlled, when wages and hours are being apportioned, when industrial relations are being adjusted, when child labor is being abolished, when housing conditions are being remedied, when banking is being studied and co-ordinated, when lynching is being debated, when the whole program of social adjustment is being laboriously rounded out, then I pray that the precepts of Christ may be made the foundation of all social legislation and that the justice of God may be apparent in all the enactments.

INEQUALITIES IN OUR SOCIAL ORDER

There are now inequalities in our social order that may rightly be called injustices crying for adjustment. I shall have time to instance, and that briefly, but two. There is, first of all, the inequality in the distribution of money. On the one side, there is the concentration

of wealth in the powerful hands of a few; on the other side, there is the prevalence of poverty that goes down to dismal depths. On the one side, the luxury of priceless delicacies; on the other, starvation and dire need, even of bread; the contrast of expensive clothes for decoration and of the lack of clothes for warmth and protection; magnificent and many mansions, as against unfit flats in the slums; facilities for extraordinary medical care, as against disease not medicated. I speak of the extremes, not of the intermediate class of comfortable people. Social Justice requires that there must be a more equitable distribution of the material goods of this world. It is the right and duty of the State to legislate so that the extremes be brought nearer together, for the common good.

A second inequality is that which has existed heretofore between capital and labor, or rather, between the classes in our social order. It is the concentration of power, as well as of wealth. Some work with their brains and others with brawn. Be it noted that both classes are working men, and that the brain-men oftentimes labor more than the brawn-men. As is inevitable, there has been an inequality of power, and hence a violation of justice. In considering this phase of Social Justice, we must grant that there is inequality of nature; some are endowed with brains, and others with muscle. There has been, likewise, an inequality radicated in our system of opportunity. But Social Justice demands that there must be an equalization, that there must be a balance between the employer and the employee, the capitalist and the laborer. Heretofore, too great power has resided in the hands of the industrialist; and the worker suffered in himself and in his family. Hereafter, through the labor union, the worker must be enabled to secure satisfaction for his just grievances, must be protected against unfair advantages, and must be guaranteed a wage and a condition of labor that will enable him and his

dependents to maintain themselves in the proper environment of proper living. Hereafter, also, the union of organized labor must not seek to extend its demands to such an extent that it will penalize capital and paralyze industry and agriculture, or in such a way that it violates the rights of others in their property or of law in the protection of other citizens.

Such inequalities as these of wealth, of position, of a majority, or force can never be remedied or balanced by mere legislation, nor yet by the ruthless enforcement of that legislation. There can be no legalized justice unless the people of our nation are educated up to a true concept of justice and unless they practise the virtue, or habit, of justice. If we wish Social Justice, we must be social-minded and just-minded. We must rid ourselves of the sins that lead to injustice. These are many, and these are grievous: there is, first of all, greed for wealth, for unnecessary and unusable wealth; greed in an inordinate desire for excess profits and unearned increments. There is ambition for power that will not be controlled and that is willing to trample down those who battle for their just and legitimate rights. There is selfishness, both of the individual and of the corporation and of the labor union, the struggle for mastery in order to ensure selfish interests, the conflict between classes, of capital and labor, or employer and employee, of rich and poor, of industry and agriculture, of one industry against another industry. There is the deceit and trickery that circumvent justice, that of the politician, that of the workman, that of the dealer, that of the producer. Sins such as these practised by the citizen or the government will make all attempts to bring about Social Justice a mockery and a failure.

THE LAW OF CHARITY

Thus far, I have spoken about justice, according to law and rights and duties. But, as I said earlier,

there is a higher law that begets a higher justice, the law of charity. The justice invoked by Shylock was not the Christian law; it was just to demand the pound of flesh, but it was not justice to take it.

Examples are many and convincing of Christ's precepts of attaining true justice through an exercise of charity. The Prodigal Son was given his inheritance and wasted it. He was starving. Justice would have let him starve; justice exercised by his father and brother would have refused him any further part in the family wealth. But, justice sanctified by charity received him back home and killed for him the fatted calf.

Or again, in the story of the laborers in the vineyard. Those who were hired late and worked but a short time in justice did not deserve pay equal to those who had been hired in the dawn and who had labored all day. But charity, added to justice, balanced their misfortune in not having been hired at dawn and they were given also a living wage.

Or again, according to justice, the woman taken in adultery should have been stoned to death. But Divine charity intervened in the person of Christ, and a tempered justice rescued her, and gently reprimanded her, and told her to sin no more.

There is danger for the social order in the application of a justice that is too narrow and too rigid. There must be added to justice the saving quality of charity and love, so that those who have all right on their side may yield some of their right, so that those who have wealth should not force their legal rights of property excessively against those who are poor, so that those who have power legally might not grind down those unfortunates who are weak. If thus they demand and exact justice, they may create new injustices. In demanding vengeance, they get vengeance in return. In exacting reparation, they suffer evil.

In those powerful words that Our Lord Jesus

Christ spoke in His Sermon on the Mount, He said: "You have heard that it hath been said: An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. But I say to you, not to resist evil; but if any man strike thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall force thee to go one mile, go with him the other two. Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not away, and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again. You have heard that it hath been said: thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy. But I say to you that hear: Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you; bless them that curse you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you."

Teaching Religion in the Home

THE most important element entering into the religious education of all children, irrespective of age, whether they attend school or not, is the example which harmonizes day after day, in word and in deed, with the spiritual training given by the parents. Father B. Jarrett, in his book, *The House of Gold*, says quite pointedly: "The essential education in boyhood and girlhood is done by character on character. It is the effect of a person on a person. We are alive and what moves us most are living things. As children, we are most affected by the human beings we meet with and especially those with whom we come into closest contact when we are young children." The salutary and golden truth expressed in these words makes it so necessary for parents at all times to give unto their own the example that God demands of them as His chosen vicars. (Extract from an address by the Most Rev. Christian H. Winkelmann, S.T.D.)

With Both Sides in Spain

DENZIL BATCHELOR

Reprinted from the Tablet (London), February 19, 1938.

(The author of this article, an English journalist, now traveling for a number of Australian newspapers and the Australian Broadcasting Commission, is one of the few journalists to have seen the Spanish Civil War from both sides. He is not a Catholic.)

I HAVE visited both sides in the Spanish War. I entered Government Spain first, and was there during last August and September; and I spent some weeks in Franco's territory in the month of December. It would not be true to say that I went to Spain without any prejudice. But I can say, truly, that I had such strong prejudices on both sides that I went to Spain as nearly neutral at heart as any human being can be, which is less than completely impartial, because it is in the nature of man to take sides in every conflict, whether he knows something or nothing about the cause at stake.

Knowing little of politics, too, I sympathized with the Government side because it was, I believed, constitutionally elected by the people of Spain, and assailed by the Governments of Italy and Germany in its efforts to govern its own country as best it saw fit. In other words, all I knew of the Spanish problem was what any reader of the English papers might gather, his observations having been given perspective and proportion by the fact that he himself happened to have spent most of his life writing not only for newspapers, but also for newspaper proprietors. And now I have seen both sides of Spain and can declare the truth as I found it.

The morning I crossed the border at Port Bou, I was assured by an American friend in the Interna-

tional Brigade that I should find life in Government Spain as normal and smooth-running as life had ever been in this eccentric country. A few days served to explain precisely what he meant by that. There is not a priest or a nun to be seen from Port Bou to Toledo; there is just one church (the cathedral in Barcelona) which is more than a shambles; but you can always go to the cinema in Madrid.

I was assured by supporters of the Government that the priests of the Spanish Church were corrupt, a comfortably inclusive, if somewhat vague accusation, which apparently satisfied those who have not been lucky enough to be spectators of the murders and tortures and the petrol bonfires with which such vast numbers of priests were privileged to pay the price of martyrdom for their alleged imperfections.

I myself saw no mutilations and massacres of religious in Government Spain for the best of reasons; there were no religious left to be massacred. I had to be satisfied with the spectacle of an unarmed man accused of resisting arrest, shot, by the police in the Ramblas, below the navel and left to die at considerable length in—as Kai Lung would say—mirth-provoking fashion before an audience of delighted women and children.

It is still, as I have said, easy to go to a cinema in Madrid, but the Roman recipe for a contented plebs is a little varied in modern Government Spain. There are enough circuses to go round, but there is not enough bread. For three days out of four in Barcelona, money, even English money, cannot buy you a single slice. If you had great political influence behind you, you might be able to obtain an egg, though it would undoubtedly be easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. You can buy as much sausage as you like, but as it was made, according to the head of an English meat-packing firm I met in Barcelona, of mule at the best and consumptive cow

at the worst, you probably did not like it very much. Wine was everywhere cheap and plentiful, and superb Spanish cognac could be bought for twopence a glass. When it is remembered that the conditions bordering on starvation that I have described existed for many nightmare months, and were still in force, even in Barcelona, with its rich hinterland, last September, it is almost unbelievable that Government Spain should still be sufficiently well-nourished to have heart to continue the struggle. But it seems to be a fact that the Spanish Army does not march on its stomach.

On both sides the little dogged Spanish infantryman has proved himself one of the indomitable fighters of history. A captain of the Requetés who has fought in eight campaigns (for and against England with a nice impartiality which leaves him strictly neutral in the final analysis) declared to me that he had never met soldiers so little liable to mortal frailties. They do not seem to need to eat, drink, sleep, to wive, or even to die. They could march further than other men could ride, and they never expect to be relieved from the trenches. War was to them an inspiration and a sustaining poetry. The battle-cry of the Legion is as holy as a prayer and as thrilling as a song: "To me, Legionaries, with bare steel! Up, death!" On Franco's side it is certain that the men are sustained by the faith that they are fighting nothing less than a holy war. You will see in a great cathedral behind the lines, the huge altar, built and dedicated and decked with a glory of flags, that waits in the nave of the church until it can be installed in its chosen fane, Madrid Cathedral.

It is hard to say how dead is the faith of the men who have religiously (so to speak) chopped the heads off the stone statues crowning every lofty church tower. There is, for instance, the remark of my friend, the bullfighter, to be weighed. "Yes, it is true, the little chapel in the bull-ring where the matadors

used to pray to the Virgin before risking youth and life, is now a ruin; but even now sometimes, the lips of the matadors can be seen moving before they enter the ring. Faith dies hard, you know, harder than bulls."

I left Government Spain convinced that that side of the argument did not have my whole-hearted support. They were, I now knew, very capable assassins. Not for nothing was the most potent political party called, not the Liberal Party, nor the Radical, but with engaging frankness, the Anarchist Party.

As for the normal life in the cities, I had seen the Telephone Exchange in Barcelona guarded like a fortress, with a battery of machine-guns, still bearing the marks of the battle for its possession which had taken place between two factions of Government supporters, which had cost a thousand lives. I had seen how the Government governed; how it was incapable of finding and distributing food, even in its richest centers; how anxious it was to take his passport from a visitor desiring to leave the country, lose it for four days, and then arrest him nightly for not possessing papers of identification.

There remained Franco's side, that foreign invasion, to be seen and disapproved of. From the superior peak of British Democracy I was determined to declare, "A plague on both your houses!"

It took a new passport to get into Franco's Spain. You put your old one "in hock," as it were, at the passport office, and are given a nice, clean one, which you would suppose would strike the enquiring Spaniard as suspiciously new for the correspondent of an Australian newspaper half-way through a world tour.

From the moment you cross the border, the immeasurable improvement in the way Spain is governed where there is no Government emphatically strikes you. The train from San Sebastian to Salamanca is due to leave at 10 o'clock. It leaves at 10 o'clock, and

arrives at Salamanca at the exact moment it is expected (but not by you) to arrive. So much for the traditional Spanish characteristic of *mañana!*

Food is abundant. The smallest villages supply you with a meal of omelette and steak for about a shilling. The Grand Hotel of Salamanca has a cuisine unsurpassed in a modest tourist's experience of Paris. The best meal I have ever eaten in my life I ate on the Madrid front. This was, of course, due chiefly to the magnificence of Spanish hospitality; but you remember that Barcelona, with equal hospitality and with all peaceful Catalonia to draw upon, could offer no more than horse or consumptive cow unsupplemented with bread.

But one goes to Spain to do more than eat. My prime interest was an investigation of the charge that Franco's attack in the Civil War is a foreign invasion. I found the facts to be these: Franco has few, if any, Germans in the field. He has German technical experts and instructors, none below the rank of sergeant, some of whom have made as their headquarters the most palatial hotel in Santander. He has 40,000 Italian infantrymen and artillerymen.

I doubt if there is one single foreign airman fighting for Franco today. I know a young British Fascist who has won his spurs (or should it be his spanners?) as a machine-gunner, and who has been trying in vain for months to put his considerable knowledge of flying at Franco's service. He will not get a job—dozens of better airmen have been returned to their own countries, and one of the best flying schools in Europe is now producing sufficient volunteers to make Franco's flying force as national as his flag.

Still, there are Italians fighting for Franco today—40,000 of them, though they may be the least reliable of his troops. There were, when I was in Spain, only half as many foreigners fighting for the Government in the International Brigade. But those 20,000 as the

heroic defense of Madrid proves are the pick of the Government forces. Franco's 40,000 Italians constitute less than one-tenth of the men he has under arms. Can they be called a foreign invasion?

It must be understood that the Tabor Regiments and the Foreign Legion are counted as wholly Spanish, as Spanish as the Australians or Canadians were British in the so-called Great War. There are, as I saw on the Madrid front, thousands of Moors fighting for Franco—for the Spanish Army, of which they have always been a unit.

Having convinced myself that the foreign invasion of Spain was just about as authentic as the Russian invasion of England during 1916, my next thought was to consider whether Franco was returning the Government a Roland for their Oliver in the matter of atrocities. I had learned in Government Spain the admitted figure of 30,000 butchered civilian Madrilenos executed, for the capital offense of not voting Left, in the Casa de Campo. I walked up the winding road now marked by redwood crosses, that leads to the lighthouse in Santander, from beneath which the bodies of many thousand men, women and children, hacked open that they might not float back to shore, were flung into the peacock-blue seas below.

I had spoken to two young commercial travelers who, for not being Basque separatists, had been imprisoned for six months in a jail-ship in Santander harbor. A Franco air-raid on a military position was revenged by eighty of their fellow prisoners being compelled to walk the plank, to be shot dead in the water if they did not drown. These brothers were kept without food for three days, and on the fourth day their ration of bread was defiled before their eyes before it was given them. One of their friends was driven by sheer starvation to steal a tin of milk which he had concealed beneath his mattress. He was caught and bludgeoned senseless on the spot. That night, he

and the two men sleeping on either side of him (who might be supposed to be contaminated by his criminal tendencies) were shot dead.

There were things to be avenged, it seemed; how did Franco avenge them? He had taken, I found, 65,000 prisoners at Santander and Bilbao; half of them have already been released. Many are now working at full pay on jobs of national importance. I spoke to Basques who were rebuilding a bridge on that road from Santander to Bilbao, which has a twist in it for every day in the year. Yes, they were being paid full wages. How had the bridge been broken? Oh, they had themselves destroyed it on their retreat from the mountains.

I saw twenty-one men and women being tried for offenses ranging from theft to murder, in Santander. I saw eight of them released after a preliminary examination, for lack of evidence. I saw the dossier of 30,000 wanted Reds, on many hundreds of whom death sentences had been passed, only to be revoked by Franco himself on the grounds that some doubt as to their full guilt still lingered. I found that 112 of these 65,000 prisoners had been executed; not, perhaps, a barbarous toll of vengeance to answer for all those victims shot and hacked open under the lighthouse at Santander.

And so I came back from Spain, which I had first visited, expecting to find myself with the Government cause. I sided with it no longer, and I have found myself regarded as an untouchable on that account by almost every Englishman with whom I have discussed the subject. To me, that is the greatest mystery of all. Every journalist I met in Spain, whether in Government or in Franco territory, whatever the political color of his paper, knew the truth about the situation; but I have yet to read that truth fully and openly published in any daily newspaper or in any paper which has not primarily the Catholic standpoint.

Private Property and Its Distribution

A. S. HEGERTY, B.A.

Reprinted from The Catholic Leader (Australia), issue of January 27, 1938.

IT is a Christian teaching that "no one ought to live unbecomingly" (*Rerum Novarum*). "The Masses of the people today require property to maintain themselves and their families in decent comfort and with reasonable security, so that they be freed from that hand-to-mouth uncertainty which is the lot of the proletarian" (*Quadragesimo Anno*). The way to provide this is to secure a better distribution of property, not to abolish the right to hold property as one's own "in stable possession."

It is self-evident that to defend the right of private property is not to defend the present distribution of property. This plain distinction ought always to be borne carefully in mind. As regards property, Leo XIII defended the right of property, and Pius XI has declared that the Leonine doctrine is also the Catholic doctrine (Q.A.).

RIGHT OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

The unanimous teaching of the theologians who have taught under the guidance and direction of the Church has always been that the right to own private property has been given to man by nature, or rather, by the Creator Himself, not only in order that indi-

viduals may be able to provide for their own needs and those of their families, but also that by means of it the goods which the Creator has destined for the human race may truly serve this purpose (Q.A.).

The right of private property being established from the natural law, it does not follow that there are no limits to that right. Private property is not intended to prevent the achievement of the common welfare, but to secure it. The State may not nullify the right but it "may regulate the exercise of the right, determining the conditions under which property may be acquired, held or transmitted to others, in order that the institution of private property which in itself is so fruitful of good and so necessary to man, may not become an obstacle to individual and social welfare" (*Capitalism and Morality*, Lewis Watt, S.J., B.Sc. (Econ.), Professor of Moral Philosophy at Heythrop College (Oxon.), p. 47).

Pope Pius declares that "provided the natural and divine law be observed, the public authority, in view of the common good, may specify more accurately what is licit and what is illicit for property-owners in the use of their possessions" (Q.A.).

THE STATE SHOULD RESPECT RIGHT OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

The right of private property may not be nullified by the State, and the regulations applied by the State must be dictated by the common good. "We must remember that the State can by no means arbitrarily dictate to the owners; it cannot even dictate all those rules that may seem desirable for public welfare. Its authority is explicitly restricted to those things that are necessary for common welfare. Therefore the formula is expressed 'in view of the common good' (*necessitate boni communis*)."
(*Reorganization of the Social Economy*, p. 109).

DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY

Now as to distribution, Pope Pius XI declares that "not every distribution of wealth and property amongst men is such that it can at all, and still less can adequately, attain the end intended by God" (Q.A.). Both wealth and property are referred to in this sentence, but in the next our attention is directed to wealth. "Wealth, therefore, which is constantly being augmented by social and economic progress, must be so distributed amongst the various individuals and classes of society that the common good of all, of which Leo XIII spoke, be thereby promoted. In other words, the good of the whole community must be safeguarded. By these principles of social justice, one class is forbidden to exclude the other from a share in the profits" (Q.A.).

SHARING OF PROFITS

It is important to note here that the economic profit resulting from the collaboration of labor and capital is not the exclusive property of either capital or labor. Both capital and labor produced it, and consequently both must share it in some proportion. The sharing of this profit, steadily pursued over a period, is intended to bring about a better distribution of private property. "In the capitalistic system, it is the rule that one party provides the property (capital), the other labor, both working in the common economic interest. Their contributions justify both parties in claiming a share of the yield" (*Reorganization of Social Economy*, p. 145.)

THE COMMON GOOD

Economists, business men, statesmen, company directors, and others who study this question to which the Pope invites attention, should bear in mind that the end to be sought is the common welfare. They

might also take account of what the Pope calls "an unanswerable argument" to show that at present distribution requires consideration and alteration. "The immense number of propertyless wage-earners on the one hand, and the super-abundant riches of the fortunate few on the other is an unanswerable argument that the earthly goods so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism are far from rightly distributed and equitably shared among the various classes of men" (Q.A.).

JUST DISTRIBUTION OF PROFITS

On this question of the division of the economic profit, and with a view to achieving the aim of Leo XIII and of Pius XI, it is necessary to take account of the further statement of Pius XI that "every effort . . . must be made that at least in future a just share only of the fruits of production be permitted to accumulate in the hands of the wealthy, and that an ample sufficiency be supplied to the workingman" (Q. A.).

What is the purpose of this direction of portion of the economic profit to workingmen? The purpose is that these men may by thrift increase their possessions, and by the prudent management thereof may be enabled to bear the family burden with greater ease and security, being freed from proletarian hand-to-mouth uncertainty, and be able to leave some little inheritance (Q.A.).